

# IN THE MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS WESTERN DISTRICT

---

## COMPLETE TITLE OF CASE

STATE OF MISSOURI,

Respondent,

v.

COREY D. BARRETT,

Appellant.

---

**DOCKET NUMBER** WD78815

**MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS  
WESTERN DISTRICT**

**DATE:** February 28, 2017

---

## APPEAL FROM

The Circuit Court of Jackson County, Missouri  
The Honorable Joel P. Fahnestock, Judge

---

## JUDGES

Division IV: Pfeiffer, C.J., and Newton and Hardwick, JJ.

CONCURRING.

---

## ATTORNEYS

Joshua D. Hawley, Attorney General  
Richard A. Starnes, Assistant Attorney General  
Jefferson City, MO

Attorneys for Respondent,

Jeannette L. Wolpink, Appellate Defender  
Kansas City, MO

Attorney for Appellant.

---



## MISSOURI APPELLATE COURT OPINION SUMMARY MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS, WESTERN DISTRICT

STATE OF MISSOURI, )  
 )  
 Respondent, )  
 v. ) **OPINION FILED:**  
 ) **February 28, 2017**  
 COREY D. BARRETT, )  
 )  
 Appellant. )

**WD78815**

**Jackson County**

**Before Division IV Judges:** Mark D. Pfeiffer, Chief Judge, and Thomas H. Newton and Lisa White Hardwick, Judges

Mr. Corey D. Barrett ("Barrett") was convicted in the Circuit Court of Jackson County ("trial court") of one count second-degree felony murder, one count first-degree burglary, one count first-degree robbery, and two counts armed criminal action. On appeal, Barrett contends that the trial court erred in admitting into evidence the statement he gave to police after his arrest because it was not voluntarily made in that his mother improperly coerced him into making the statement at the behest of the police. Barrett also contends that there was insufficient evidence to support his convictions for first-degree robbery and related armed criminal action.

**AFFIRMED.**

**Division IV holds:**

(1) The trial court did not err in admitting Barrett's statement to police because Barrett indicated to police that he understood his right to remain silent and there was no evidence that the police coached Barrett's mother or requested that she solicit Barrett's cooperation during the interrogation.

(2) There was sufficient evidence to support Barrett's convictions for first-degree robbery and related armed criminal action under a theory of accomplice liability. The evidence presented showed: that Barrett affirmatively associated himself with his co-actor in the robbery by planning to steal from the victim's house; that the two men actually entered the

victim's home with the intent to commit a robbery; that the co-actor and/or Barrett were likely caught in the house by their victim; and that deadly force was used against the victim to perpetrate the robbery.

**Opinion by: Mark D. Pfeiffer, Chief Judge**

February 28, 2017

\* \* \* \* \*

THIS SUMMARY IS UNOFFICIAL AND SHOULD NOT BE QUOTED OR CITED.